



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/535,161	03/24/2000	Loubaris Mohamed Faical	78-1	4480

23772 7590 12/31/2003

STEPHEN CHRISTOPHER SWIFT
SWIFT LAW OFFICE
SUITE 600
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2840

EXAMINER

BRINEY III, WALTER F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2644

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/535,161

Applicant(s)

FAICAL, LOUBARIS MOHAMED

Examiner

Walter F Briney III

Art Unit

2644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In regard to claim 1, the limitation of “**a means of disconnection command**” fails to meet the enablement requirement because the invention is disclosed as a way to inhibit further user stations from using a telephone line after one station has already assumed control of the telephone line. There is no means disclosed to disconnect any of the user stations. For the purpose of this office action the examiner assumes the limitation of “**a means of connection inhibition.**”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9, 12-17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Coker (US Patent, 5,444,772).

Claim 1 is limited to **an electronic switching system**. Coker discloses a telephone line from a central office (i.e. **a common source of voltage**) that is shared by a plurality of extension telephones (i.e. **a plurality of user stations connected in parallel**) (figure 5). Coker discloses a telephone lockout device (i.e. **an electronic means of connection**) (figure 2, element 10) that connects between a telephone (i.e. **a chosen user station**) and a modular jack to a central office line (i.e. **common source of voltage**) (figure 2). Coker discloses a telephone lockout device (i.e. **a means of connection inhibition**) that includes an **optical coupler** (figure 4, element 14) that prevents other user telephones from using the line (i.e. **to automatically control electronic inhibition of other user stations to the common source of voltage**) (column 1, line 65-column 2, line 29). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 2 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 1**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses a selected extension telephone (i.e. **a default user station**) that controls and prevents other extension telephones from accessing the line while its switch hook is raised (i.e. **that is the normally chosen user station**) (column 1, line 65-column 2, line 29). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 3 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 2**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses a rectifier for each extension telephone (i.e.

a means of separation of grounds for the chosen user station and the other user stations) (figure 3 and 4, element 32). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 4 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 3**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses a telephone lockout device connected to each extension telephone (i.e. **including a cell for each user station**) (figure 5, elements 10). Coker discloses a cascade of components including (i.e. **with each cell including in series**) two rectifiers (i.e. **a means for separation of the grounds/a means for filtering a signal and for rectification of alternating current**) (figures 3 and 4, elements 32 and 58), tip and ring lines (i.e. **a means for electrically connecting terminals of the chosen station at boundaries of the source of voltage**) (figures 3 and 4), a by-pass circuit (i.e. **a means for determination of a response time of the cell**) (column 5, lines 5-16), and an optoisolator photo-coupled darlington transistor (i.e. **means for command of inhibition including optical couplers**) (figures 3 and 4, element 14) that blocks other extension phones from being activated when it is conducting (i.e. **to control the electronic inhibition of the source of the voltage of the other cells**) (column 4, line 57-column 5, line 4). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 5 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 4**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses an optical coupler diode (figures 3 and 4, element 16) connected in series with a Zener diode (figures 3 and 4, element 20) (i.e.

wherein the optical couplers are electrically connected in series). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 6 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 4**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses an optical coupler diode (figures 3, and 4, element 16) connected in parallel to a transistor (figures 3 and 4, element 24) (i.e. **wherein the optical couplers are electrically connected in parallel).** Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 7 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 4**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses that the darlington transistor is momentarily deactivated by (i.e. **the response time is determined by**) (column 5, lines 5-16) a by-pass circuit (i.e. **a circuit in each cell**) (figures 3 and 4, element 22) including a resistor (i.e. **containing at least one resistor**) (figures 3 and 4, element 26) and a capacitor (i.e. **and at least one capacitor**) (figures 3 and 4, element 28). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 8 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 7**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses a selected extension telephone (i.e. **the default user station**) that controls and prevents the other extension telephones from accessing the line when its switch hook is raised (column 1, lines 65-column 2, line 3). Coker discloses a telephone lockout device (i.e. **the cell**) that has a by-pass circuit (i.e. has a response time) (column 5, lines 5-16). It is inherent that, for the selected extension telephone to control and prevent other extension telephone from accessing the line at a time when more than one phone is taken off-hook at the same time the

selected extension telephone must have a by-pass circuit that responds faster than another by-pass circuit (i.e. **the response time of the default user station is lower than the response time of the other cells**). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 9 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 8**, as covered by Coker. Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim with the exception **in which at least one of the cells includes a switch in parallel with a resistor, and when the switch is closed the cell's user station becomes the default user station**. Coker discloses a resistor (figure 4, element 54) in parallel with a switch (figure 4, element 48), and when the transistor is conducting the extension telephone connected to the telephone lock-out device gains access to the phone line (i.e. **becomes the default user station**) (column 8, line 6-column 9, line 3). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 12 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 8**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses a transistor (figure 4, element 48) (i.e. **a transistor of command**). When the transistor conducts it activates a first darlington transistor (figure 42, element 44) (i.e. **when conductive causes a transistor of connection to become conductive**), when the first darlington transistor conducts a transistor path (figure 4, element 44 path 5 to 4) is closed between the tip and ring lines. The path of current is through a rectifier circuit (figure 4, element 58) (i.e. **means for filtering the signal and for rectification of alternating current**) and the second first transistor (figure 4, element 44) of the extension telephone, and thus allowing a

connection of the extension telephone to the central office (i.e. **causing the electrical connection of the chosen user station with the source of voltage**) (column 8, line 6-column 9, line 3). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 13 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 12**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses a first transistor (i.e. **the transistor of command**) (figure 4, element 48) with a base connected to a Zener diode (i.e. **a switch normally open**) (figure 4, element 52) that connects the base to a ground (i.e. **in which a base of the transistor of command can be connected with a ground by a switch normally open**). Coker discloses that when the Zener diode is closed (i.e. **when the switch is closed**) the voltage at the base of the transistor will be lowered enough to stop conducting, therefore the LED (figure 4, element 44) will stop conducting and the path between the TIP and RING lines of the extension telephone through the darlington transistor (figure 4, element 46) will be open (i.e. **the electronic connection of the associated station is blocked from the source of voltage**) (column 8, line 6-column 9, line 3). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 14 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 13**, as covered by Coker. Coker teaches an add-on procedure, where a user can be connected by activating a hook switch by hand (i.e. **manually**). By activating the hook switch, the Zener diode (i.e. **the switch**) (figure 4, element 52) will open and close in response (i.e. **wherein the switch that is normally open can be manually closed**) (column 8, lines 32-62). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 15 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 4**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses a by-pass circuit for passing transients (i.e. **means for determination of the response time of the cell**) (figures 3 and 4, element 22) that includes a transistor (i.e. **that includes a trigger circuit**) (figures 3 and 4, element 24) that shorts out and thus prevents the lock-out circuit (figures 3 and 4, element 12) from activating (i.e. **which determines a response time of blocking the activation of the means for command of inhibition**) (column 5, lines 5-16).

Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 16 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 15**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses a capacitor (figures 3 and 4, element 28) that **wherein the transistor (i.e. trigger circuit) (figures 3 and 4, element 24) is controlled by a charging and a discharging of a capacitor** (column 5, lines 5-16).

Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 17 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 4**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses using the telephone lockout circuit in conjunction with extension telephones (i.e. **wherein the user stations are telephone sets**) (column 1, line 56-column 2, line 3). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 19 is essentially the same as claim 4, as covered by Coker, but with the further limitation **wherein each user station is electrically connected to a cell, and at least one cell is electrically connected to a plurality of user stations**. Coker discloses each extension telephone (i.e. **a user station**) being connected to a lock-out

device (i.e. **a cell**) (figure 5, elements 10) and each lock-out device is connected to all the other lock-out devices by a modular jack, therefore each lock-out device is connected to all extension telephones (i.e. **a plurality of user stations**). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim 20 is essentially the same as claim 4, as covered by Coker, but with the further limitation **wherein each user station is electrically connected to a cell, and at least one cell is electrically connected to another cell**. Coker discloses each lock-out device (i.e. **a cell**) being connected to every lock-out device by a modular jack (figure 5). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coker.

Claim 10 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 8**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses two full-wave bridge rectifiers (i.e. **means of separation of grounds**) of a diode type (column 5, lines 17-29 and lines 55-57). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim with the exception **in which the means of separation of the grounds is a bridge of four diodes**. The examiner takes

Official Notice of the fact that full-wave bridge rectifiers having four diodes (i.e. **in which the means of separation of the grounds is a bridge of four diodes**) are well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the well-known four diode configuration in the circuit taught by Coker for the purpose of implementing the bridge rectifiers. Therefore, Coker makes obvious all limitations of the claim.

Claim 11 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 8**, as covered by Coker. Coker further discloses two full-wave bridge rectifiers (i.e. **means of separation of grounds**) of a diode type (column 5, lines 17-29 and lines 55-57). Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim with the exception **wherein the means of separation of the grounds is a bridge of two diodes and two thyristors**. The examiner takes Official Notice of the fact that full-wave bridge rectifiers having two diodes and two thyristors (i.e. **wherein the means of separation of the grounds is a bridge of two diodes and two thyristors**) are well-known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the well-known two-diode and two-thyristor configuration in the circuit taught by Coker for the purpose of implementing the bridge rectifiers. Therefore, Coker makes obvious all limitations of the claim.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coker in view of Frailey (US Patent 4,281,220).

Claim 18 is limited to **an electronic switching system according to claim 4**, as covered by Coker. Therefore, Coker anticipates all limitations of the claim with the

exception **wherein the user stations are motors**. Frailey discloses a motor driven (figure 2, element 37) dial-operating drive disc used with a telephone (i.e. **wherein the user stations are motors**) (abstract) that enables a severely handicapped person to use a telephone (column 2, lines 14-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the extension telephones of Coker with the motor drive dial-operating drive disc telephone as taught by Frailey for the purpose of enabling severely handicapped people to operate the phone.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter F Briney III whose telephone number is 703-305-0347. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester W Isen can be reached on 703-305-4386. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

WFB
12/22/03


XU MEI
PRIMARY EXAMINER